UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,738	04/25/2000	KEVIN B. GJERSTAD	1018.097US1	9935

45809	7590	12/21/2005

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
(c/o MICROSOFT CORPORTATION)
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER
SMITH, PETER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 September 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 20-26</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 20-26</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 9/27/2005.

2.   Claims 1-5 and 20-26 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 20, and 23 are independent

claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 05/10/1996 in view of Maslov, US 6,466,240 B1 provisional

application filed 7/8/1998 and Froessl, US 5,109,439 patented 4/28/1992.

Regarding independent claim 1, Saunders teaches a text store interface to permit an

application having a document of primarily text to expose the document as an abstraction in fig.

1, 2, 5, col. 2 lines 6-16, col. 3 lines 53-65, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44. Saunders teaches a

text stream interface in which the abstraction of the document appears as an array, a position

within the document represented as an offset from a beginning of the array in fig. 1, 4a, 4b, and

col. 7 lines 18-32. Saunders teaches a text processor input method for attaching a property to the

document in at least one position in the document, wherein the property preserves a relationship

between a text service and the identified range in fig. 5, col. 2 lines 42-45, and col. 6 lines 28-38.

In col. 6 lines 28-38 Saunders teaches a unique identifier, which is a property attached to the

range of text for the purpose of providing access to the range of text. Saunders teaches a text

input processor interface to permit a handler for an input device to access the abstraction of the

document and to insert additional text into the document in fig. 4a, 4b, 5, col. 1 line 55- col. 2

line 29, col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44. Saunders does not,

however teach that the property preserves originally entered data in order to facilitate text

correction. Saunders teaches a tree structure for organizing the document content in fig. 3, but

does not teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is such that a

position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node.

Maslov does teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is

such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node in the abstract,

col. 2 line 62 – col. 3 line 17, and col. 3 lines 26-44. Maslov can select or anchor nodes of text

for manipulation by the user. Froessl does teach attaching a property to a document, wherein the

property preserves originally entered data in order to facilitate text correction in fig. 1, fig. 2, and

col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have combined Maslov and Froessl into Saunders to have created

the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the dynamic text

interface taught by Maslov to have improved Saunders so that the documents editable by

Saunders would have included structured document trees consisting of nodes of text. It would

have been obvious and desirable to have used the original data access facilitating text correction

as taught by Froessl in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. This teaching of Froessl

would have enabled a modified Saunders to have stored data as it was originally entered by the

text input services so that it would be available to facilitate text correction in accordance with the

teaching of Froessl.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Saunders teaches a method for selecting at least one of

the text stream interface and the dynamic text interface by which to expose the document as an

abstraction in fig. 1, 2, and col. 1 lines 55-65. Saunders teaches wherein the method selects the

text stream interface for documents stored as an array and the dynamic interface for documents

stored in a tree-based structure in fig. 3.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Saunders teaches a range object in which a range within

the document is specified as two positions within the abstraction of the document, such that the

handler inserts the additional text into the document and accesses the abstraction of the document

at the range specified by the range object in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Saunders teaches insertion accomplished via a first

method of a text input processor interface, and access is accomplished via a second method of a

text input processor interface in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Saunders teaches wherein the text input processor

interface further permits the handler for the input device to attach the property to the document at

the range specified by the range object in fig. 5, col. 2 lines 42-45, and col. 6 lines 28-38. In col.

6 lines 28-38 Saunders teaches a unique identifier, which is a property attached to the range of

text for the purpose of providing access to the range of text.

5.   **Claims 20, 21, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 05/10/1996 in view of Froessl, US 5,109,439 patented

4/28/1992.

Regarding independent claim 20, Saunders teaches a text input processor interface to

permit a handler for an input device to access the abstraction of the document and to insert

additional text into the document in fig. 4a, 4b, 5, col. 1 line 55- col. 2 line 29, col. 4 line 59 –

col. 5 line 9, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44. Saunders teaches a range object in which a range

within the document is specified as two positions within the abstraction of the document, such

that the handler inserts the additional text into the document and accesses the abstraction of the

document at the range specified by the range object in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44.

Saunders teaches insertion accomplished via a first method of a text input processor interface,

and access is accomplished via a second method of a text input processor interface in fig. 5 and

col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44. Saunders teaches a method by which the handler is able to attach a

property to the document at a range specified by the range object, wherein the property preserves

a relationship between a text service and the identified range in fig. 5, col. 2 lines 42-45, and col.

6 lines 28-38. In col. 6 lines 28-38 Saunders teaches a unique identifier, which is a property

attached to the range of text for the purpose of providing access to the range of text. Saunders

does not, however teach that the property provides access to original data used for insertion of

text within the range.

Froessl does teach attaching a property to a document, wherein the property preserves

originally entered data in order to facilitate text correction in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 –

col. 8 line 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined Froessl into Saunders to have created the claimed

invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the original data access

facilitating text correction as taught by Froessl in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5.

This teaching of Froessl would have enabled a modified Saunders to have stored data as it was

originally entered by the text input services so that it would be available to facilitate text

correction in accordance with the teaching of Froessl.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Saunders teaches a text store interface to permit an

application having a document of primarily text to expose the document as an abstraction in fig.

1, 2, 5, col. 2 lines 6-16, col. 3 lines 53-65, and col. 6 line 39 - col. 7 line 44.

Regarding independent claim 23, Saunders teaches receiving original raw data from at

least one of a plurality of input devices in fig. 1, fig. 4, col. 1 line 55 – col. 2 line 29, and col. 4

line 59 – col. 5 line 9. Saunders discloses specifying a range within a document, wherein the

range utilizes at least one floating position in fig. 5 and col. 6 line 39 – col. 7 line 44. Saunders

teaches a method by which the handler is able to attach a property to the document at a range

specified by the range object, wherein the property preserves a relationship between a text

service and the identified range in fig. 5, col. 2 lines 42-45, and col. 6 lines 28-38. In col. 6 lines

28-38 Saunders teaches a unique identifier, which is a property attached to the range of text for

the purpose of providing access to the range of text. Saunders does not, however teach that the

property provides access to original data used for insertion of text within the range.

Froessl does teach storing original raw data in a property that is attachable to a document

and attaching the property to a document, wherein the property preserves original raw data in

order to facilitate text correction in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

combined Froessl into Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been

obvious and desirable to have used the original raw data access facilitating text correction as

taught by Froessl in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. This teaching of Froessl

would have enabled a modified Saunders to have stored data as it was originally entered by the

text input services so that it would be available to facilitate text correction in accordance with the

teaching of Froessl.

Regarding dependent claim 24, Saunders teaches wherein at least two of the plurality of

input devices can simultaneously provide the original raw data in fig. 1, fig. 4, col. 1 line 55 –

col. 2 line 29, and col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9.

Regarding dependent claim 25, Saunders does not teach providing a context that

includes additional information about the original raw data and utilizing the context to convert

the received original raw data into text. Froessl does teach providing a context that includes

additional information about the original raw data and utilizing the context to convert the

received original raw data into text in fig. 1, fig. 2, col. 3 line 60 – col. 4 line 23, and col. 7 line

63 – col. 8 line 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have combined the teachings of Saunders and Froessl to have created the

claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the context as taught

by Froessl to have improved Saunders so that additional information would have been available

to the user to assist in facilitating text correction using the original raw data.

Regarding dependent claim 26, Saunders teaches specifying a range of text to enable a

text service to modify or replace the text in fig. 5, col. 2 lines 42-45, and col. 6 lines 28-38.

Saunders does not teach wherein the context is determined by the range specified within the document. Froessl does teach providing a context that includes additional information about the original raw data and utilizing the context to convert the received original raw data into text in fig. 1, fig. 2, col. 3 line 60 – col. 4 line 23, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Saunders and Froessl to have created the claimed invention. In light of the suggested context teaching of Froessl, it would have been obvious and desirable to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used the range specified within the document because it was known at the time of the invention that different portions of a document typically contain different kinds of information. This difference would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to have derived a context from these differences.

6.   **Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 05/10/1996 in view of Froessl, US 5,109,439 patented 4/28/1992 as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Maslov, US 6,466,240 B1 provisional application filed 7/8/1998.**

Regarding dependent claim 22, Saunders teaches a text stream interface in which the abstraction of the document appears as an array, a position within the document represented as an offset from a beginning of the array in fig. 1, 4a, 4b, and col. 7 lines 18-32. Saunders also teaches an application which selects at least one of the text stream interface and the dynamic text interface by which to expose the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 2, and col. 1 lines 55-65.

Saunders does not teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is

such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node.

Maslov does teach a dynamic text interface in which the abstraction of the document is

such that a position within a document represented as a floating anchor to a node in the abstract,

col. 2 line 62 – col. 3 line 17, and col. 3 lines 26-44. Maslov can select or anchor nodes of text

for manipulation by the user. Froessl does teach attaching a property to a document, wherein the

property preserves originally entered data in order to facilitate text correction in fig. 1, fig. 2, and

col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have combined Maslov and Froessl into Saunders to have created

the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the dynamic text

interface taught by Maslov to have improved Saunders so that the documents editable by

Saunders would have included structured document trees consisting of nodes of text. It would

have been obvious and desirable to have used the original data access facilitating text correction

as taught by Froessl in fig. 1, fig. 2, and col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line 5. This teaching of Froessl

would have enabled a modified Saunders to have stored data as it was originally entered by the

text input services so that it would be available to facilitate text correction in accordance with the

teaching of Froessl.

Response to Arguments

7.   The Examiner has reordered the rejection of claim 22 so that it now follows the rejection

of independent claim 20 instead of being grouped with independent claim 1 and dependent

claims 2-5 as pointed out by Applicant. The actual rejection of dependent claim 22 has not been

changed. The Examiner apologizes if this caused Applicant any confusion.

8.   Applicant's arguments filed 9/27/2005 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. Regarding Applicant's arguments in pages 7 and 8 that Saunders, Maslov, and

Froessl do not teach all the limitations of independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-5, the

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Saunders teaches a reservation system for uniquely identifying

a range of text and associating a text handler with the range of text. Saunders teaches in col. 6

lines 55-67 that the range of text is identified and associated with a particular text input handler

as long as the reservation identifier has a non-zero value. Saunders does not teach that the

original data is preserved and associated with the range of text. However, the Examiner believes

Froessl provides this teaching to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Froessl teaches attaching original data to a document via a property in col. 7 line 63 – col. 8 line

5. A document ID is the property linking the original data to the document. One of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention would have improved each range of Saunders by

attaching the original data to the range via the properties in the same fashion that Froessl attaches

original data to a whole document. Since both Saunders and Froessl teach associating properties

with text, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been able to

have combined the teachings of Saunders and Froessl for the motivation of enabling human

review and correction of the text using the original data as is specifically taught by Froessl in col.
8 lines 2-5. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that Saunders, Maslov, and Froessl in
combination teach all the limitations of the inventions of claims 1-5.

Regarding Applicant's arguments in pages 8 and 9 that Saunders, Maslov, and Froessl do
not teach all the limitations of independent claims 20, 23 and dependent claims 21, 22, and 24-
26, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Saunders teaches a reservation system for uniquely
identifying a range of text and associating a text handler with the range of text. Saunders teaches
in col. 6 lines 55-67 that the range of text is identified and associated with a particular text input
handler as long as the reservation identifier has a non-zero value. Saunders does not teach that
the original data is preserved and associated with the range of text. However, the Examiner
believes Froessl provides this teaching to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention. Froessl teaches attaching original data to a document via a property in col. 7 line 63 –
col. 8 line 5. A document ID is the property linking the original data to the document. One of
ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have improved each range of Saunders
by attaching the original data to the range via the properties in the same fashion that Froessl
attaches original data to a whole document. In the claimed invention, the original data is
preserved through an association to the range of text. Both Saunders and Froessl create
associations to text. Saunders teaches associating a text input device to a range of text and
Froessl teaches associating original data to an entire text document. Since both Saunders and
Froessl teach associating properties with text, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention would have been able to have combined the teachings of Saunders and Froessl for the
motivation of enabling human review and correction of the text using the original data as is

specifically taught by Froessl in col. 8 lines 2-5. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that

Saunders, Maslov, and Froessl in combination teach all the limitations of the inventions of

claims 20-26.

Conclusion

9.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. Suhm, et al., "Model-based and Empirical Evaluation of Multimodal Interactive

Error Correction", Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing

Systems, May 1999, pages 584-591 discloses improved error correction in speech user

interfaces.

10.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Peter J. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
12/13/2005

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
12/17/2005